DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 097 050 JC 740 372

AUTHOR	Fea, Henry R., Ed.; And Others
TITLE	Proceedings: Conference on Compensatory/Remedial Education, May 16 and 17, 1974. Occasional Paper No. 23.
INSTITUTION	Washington Univ., Seattle. Center for Development of Community Coll. Education.
REPORT NO	Occas-Pap-23
PUB DATE	Jul 74
NOTE	51p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Communication (Thought Transfer); Community Colleges; *Compensatory Education; *Conference Reports; *Critical Thinking; *Developmental Programs; English Instruction; Post Secondary Education; *Remedial Instruction

ABSTRACT

Two papers given at a conference on compensatory/remedial education are provided. The first paper, "How to Plan a Developmental English Program with College-Wide Cooperation" by Edith A. Freligh, discusses the hypothesis that certain kinds of personalities are attracted to certain kinds of disciplines, applying it to teachers, students, and administrators. Requirements for developing programs are given. In the second paper, "Critical Thinking in Communication" by Henry R. Fea, the need for adults to be able to distinguish critical thinking from other types of thought, to understand the process of thinking critically, and to be able to teach children to think critically is discussed. An appendix lists the conference participants. (DB)

ED 097050

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PROCEEDINGS:

CONFERENCE ON COMPENSATORY/REMEDIAL EDUCATION

May 16 and 17, 1974

Henry R. Fea
Henry M. Reitan
Michael E. Randall
Editors

Center for Development of Community
College Education

University of Washington

Frederic T. Giles, Director

Occasional Paper Number 23

Seattle, Washington

July, 1974

JC 740 372

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... i

PREFACE..... ii

HOW TO PLAN A DEVELOPMENTAL ENGLISH PROGRAM WITH COLLEGE-WIDE COOPERATION
Edith A. Freligh..... 1-34

CRITICAL THINKING IN COMMUNICATION
Henry R. Fea..... 35-42

APPENDIX
List of Participants..... 43-47

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The success of this conference was due in large part to the efforts of those resource people who, despite their protestations to the contrary, displayed great expertise and courage in acting as catalysts in the group meetings. We want to thank them.

Henry M. Reitan
Henry R. Fea
Michael E. Randall

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PREFACE

Here are the papers delivered by Dr. Edith Freligh and Dr. Henry Fea. We hope you enjoyed the Compensatory/Remedial Education Conference held at Travelodge-at-Sea-Tac May 16 and 17, and hope you gained from it professionally, too.

Many more people attended this year than last (61 as opposed to about 35), and we hope this trend continues in future years. Perhaps we will be able to expand our meetings to include more specific and detailed work in the areas of Adult Basic Education, remedial math programs, and so forth.

We will be using your evaluation forms in next year's planning and would appreciate fruther suggestions if you wish to correspond with us. In case you have forgotten, here is our address:

COMPENSATORY CONFERENCE COMMITTEE
Center for the Development of
Community College Education
M201 Miller Hall DQ-12
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195

Again, thanks for your interest and participation.

Frederic T. Giles

Dr. Frederic T. Giles, Dean
College of Education
University of Washington

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HOW TO PLAN A DEVELOPMENTAL ENGLISH PROGRAM WITH COLLEGE-WIDE COOPERATION

Edith A. Freligh*

Piet Hein is a Danish scientist-turned-poet who is the inventor and author of GROOKS. A GROOK is a short, aphoristic poem, accompanied by an appropriate drawing, revealing in a minimum of words and with a minimum of lines some basic truth about the human condition. Hein invented grooks during the Nazi occupation of Denmark as a sort of underground language just out of reach of the understanding of the Germans. The first one here presented is designed to provide ammunition for those of you who have the temerity to disagree with everything I shall have to say:

THE UNTENABLE ARGUMENT

My adversary's argument
is not alone malevolent
   but ignorant to boot.
He hasn't even got the sense
to state his so-called evidence
   in terms I can refute.
(Hein, Grooks 2, p. 10)

I have a hypothesis. Part of it is somewhat anthropological in approach and suggests that those of us who live and work in educational (or any other bureaucratic) institutions behave in ways which are almost ritualistic, which are certainly conditioned by the bureaucratic and academic cultures, and which involve both "password" or "shibboleth" behavior and taboos. Sanctioned behavior--in our setting--may include

*Associate Dean of Instruction, Golden West College

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the notion among teachers, e.g., that if one would be accepted by colleagues, one must be--by definition--anti-whatever everyone else is currently anti--(administration, remedial students, Republicans, etc.) A strong taboo in any academic community is to be politically conservative, e.g. Among teachers, behavior which actively supports improvement of working conditions (salary, hours, teaching load, class size) is strongly approved; behavior which appears to be that of an "informer" for administration is strongly taboo. Among administrators, behavior which suggests that administrators who deserve it should be fired for irresponsible management or poor judgment is taboo; behavior which exhibits ambition for "higher" administrative position or promotion--even though it may mean leaving the current institution at some loss to the institution--is heartily sanctioned; leaving administration for teaching is taboo, etc.

A second part of the hypothesis is that certain kinds of personalities are attracted to certain kinds of disciplines. An extrovert who is concerned chiefly with people, for example, who values human contacts above all things, who tends to be loyal to a respected person or cause, and has a strong sense of "shoulds" and "should nots" may well be attracted to the social sciences--political science, history, sociology. On the other hand, an introvert who chooses his final values without reference to the judgment of outsiders, who is very warm inside but hardly shows it until one gets past his reserve, who is tolerant, open-minded, understanding, and wants to contribute to something that matters (a purpose beyond his

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

paycheck) may be attracted to art, psychology, or literature. The student attracted to a major in the humanities, or, more specifically, in language or literature may be quick, ingenious, gifted along several lines, lively and stimulating company, ready to argue for fun on any side of a question. He may be creative, imaginative, certainly humane. He may exercise considerable insight; he probably enjoys reading and may be particularly good at either speaking or writing or both. He is an idealist. He may also be impractical, individualistic to the point of resisting any form of prescribed institutional behavior; he may find it difficult to accept criticism; he probably hates routine and finds it exceptionally hard to apply himself to humdrum detail.

A. TEACHERS

Now, if it is true--or even temporarily acceptable to this audience--that given personalities are more likely to be attracted to "matching" disciplines, or to those disciplines which provide the kinds of reinforcement of values and attitudes which are either comforting or inviting, then it may also be true that engaging in a career which requires the teaching of that discipline may well continue to reinforce those qualities of personality which attracted one to a given discipline in the first place. The humanist may become even more likely to espouse humane causes, the scientist to rely extensively on demonstrable facts for the shaping of his attitudes, the sociologist to build a better world, the artist to resist infringement on or interruption of his creative pursuits.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Myers-Briggs Personality Type Inventory used in a management series, "Manager: Know Your Effectiveness," at Golden West College in Huntington Beach, California in January of this year,

> is derived from Jungian personality theory which postulates that people have certain basic differences which began as tendencies, turned into habits of mind, and, if strongly developed, produce specialized skill. Recognition, understanding, and acceptance of these differences on the part of the administrators of the organization should lead to a decrease in tensions within that organization, since much of what is incomprehensible and unacceptable to others stems from an unconscious assumption that others are basically like ourselves and therefore ought to perceive and react to the world as we do. Once, however, an administrator takes a positon that others (including other administrators) are basically different, he can begin to understand and make allowances for those differences so as to make those differences contribute to the goals of the insitution. The authors of the Inventory caution that if we do not stop to think about type differences, we will automatically present our ideas in terms of what matters to our own types, and, for all types except our own, that will be the wrong approach. (Keirsey and Bates, p. 1)

All of us fall into one of four types: sensing-perceptive (SP), sensing-judging (SJ), intuitive-thinking (NT), or intuitive-feeling (NF). None of us is a "pure," however, and usually contain a mix of each quality. All of the S's (sensing types) respond more readily to appearances, to verifiable information, to realities. The N's (intuitive types) take in the possibilities, tend to exercise vision, insight. The J (judging) person likes to have things settled, decided; he may be tactless and a poor listener; decisive, he may judge too hastily. The P (perceptive) type is more likely to look for a solution instead of imposing a judgment of his own; he may be open-minded, tolerant, a good listener; he seeks to understand people rather than to judge them.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HOW TO PLAN A DEVELOPMENTAL ENGLISH PROGRAM WITH COLLEGE-WIDE COOPERATION
Edith A. Freligh

ATTITUDES	
Perception	Judgment
Wait & see	Decide
Let it happen	Runs his life
Tarry	Get going
Adapt as we go	Plan ahead

HUMANITIES

NF

Integrity
Identity
Meaning
Self-worth
Authenticity

(Have language facility, fascination with words. Writers here.)

ARTS & CRAFTS

SP

Pleasure-loving, hedonistic
Freedom, autonomy, pleasure
Spontaneity

(All gratification needs)

(Artists, theater types, actors here.

SCIENCES

NT

Competence
Ability
Powers — Power
Control — over
Ingenuity — self
Knowledge
Capability

SERVICES, BUSINESS, ADMINISTRATION, EDUC.

SJ

To belong, be related
To have institutions — Social
To be together — Needs
To care for

N=intuitive, S=sensing, F=feeling, T-thinking, P=perceiving, J=judging

(Notes from the Keirsey-Bates presentation)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

N's are the "thinker-uppers"; S's are the "getter-doners."

> An appreciation for the strengths of each style, can, hopefully, cut out unnecessary friction within an organization. For example, in a decision-making, problem-solving situation, an awareness on the part of all participants that a thinking type will want the solution to the problem which is systematic, that a sensation type will want the solution to work, that the feeling type will want the solution to take into account the feelings of those involved in a humanistic manner, that the intuitive type will want a door left open for growth and improvement in the future, and that a perceiving type wants problems to be solved automatically may cause those involved to remember that people are different and react to the inner and outer world in very different ways. (Keirsey & Bates, pp. 1-2)

And all of this does have something to do with (a) my hypothesis, and (b) my thesis! Chances are good that you are described accurately as one of the following personality types if you are indeed an English or literature major:

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TYPE IN HIGH SCHOOL

> ENFP (Extroverted intuitive type):
> Quick, ingenious, gifted in many lines, lively and stimulating company, alert and outspoken, argues for fun on either side of the question. Resourceful in solving new and challenging problems, but tends to neglect routine assignments as a boring waste of time. Turns to one new interest after another. Can always find excellent reasons for whatever he wants.

SUMMARY

> More enthusiastic, more concerned with people and skillful in handling them. Has remarkable insight into their possibilities and interest in their development. May be inspired and inspiring teacher, scientist, artist, advertising man, salesman, politician, or almost anything it intersts him to be. (Keirsey & Bates)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TYPE IN HIGH SCHOOL

INFP (Introverted feeling type):
Particularly enthusiastic about books, reads or tells the parts he likes best to his friends. Interested and responsive in class, always warm, friendly personality but is not sociable just for the sake of sociability and seldom puts his mind on his possessions or physical surroundings.

SUMMARY

Takes in the possibilities. Mildly resembles an extroverted intuitive, particularly in liking to concentrate on a project and disliking all details not relevant to any deep interest. Marked by insight and long-range vision, curious about new ideas, interested in books and language. Likely to have a gift of expression, especially in writing, and to be ingenious and persuasive on the subject of his enthusiasms. which are quiet but deep-rooted. (Keirsey and Bates)

If it is true that one of the descriptions accurately describes your personality or behavior, then it may be that your attitudes toward, success or failure with, remedial and developmental programs is at least partially explained. Certainly your attitudes toward your students will be a reflection of your personal values and personality. If you impose your own type needs on your students, assuming that their needs equal yours, you may fail with those who differ!

I am, as you have noted, still describing teachers, not students or programs or administrators or institutions. Those will come in a moment.

The chances are also good that your education and experience are similar to those reported in the literature. Stock, an English teacher in an eastern community college, reported in "From Ivy League to Community

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Colleges" (Change, Sept. 1973) that 10% of the English department at his college come from Ivy-league teaching, and another 25% from similar four-year institutions. Most, he says, view themselves as teachers (rather than publishing scholars) and fall into 2 categories: (1) impersonal, task-oriented, empirical, standards-approach instructors, and (2) romantic, personal, subjective, process-oriented "catalysts". But both kinds of teachers center their interests and focus on students rather than on textual analysis or academic discipline.

However, Eley, in "English Programs for Terminal Students" (Proceedings of the NCTE Tempe Conference, 1965) indicates that--in 1965--only 10% of remedial English teachers had had "any special training whatsoever, either in linguistics or in reading." (p. 101)

Now, if it is true that most of you were attracted to majors with a heavy emphasis on literature, and if it is true that your education (and perhaps some experience as well) has been in four-year colleges and university systems, and if it is true that you tend to be--by and large--an intuitive, impractical, imaginative group of idealists and dreamers out to save the world, then consider the implications all of those factors combined might have for the plodding, repetitive, systematic, detailed, exceedingly practical, diagnostic, and analytical teaching which must be brought to bear on work with students who exhibit language disabilities or inhibitions. These are people who differ fundamentally from you!

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

B. STUDENTS

Let's talk about students. Piet Hein offers some more advice:

A TIP

(to members of the literary profession)

Those
who can write
have a
lot to
learn from those
bright
enough
not to.
(Hein, Grooks 2, p. 52)

Higher education has changed considerably. Its early history in America was aristocratic. The advent of land-grant colleges in the mid-19th century changed that concept somewhat, creating what Jencks and Riesman have called a meritocracy which reached its peak in the 1950's: the deserving student must be served regardless of his socio-economic background. From the 1950's through the '60's, the emphasis in admissions offices has been strongly egalitarian; higher education has become a right, and the provision of geographic and economic opportunity to all students has been legislated in some states. "Affirmative action" has now become pervasive--from recruitment of students from all minority groups to employment of all faculty and staff.

The rise of egalitarianism inevitably affected the kind of student we have, especially in the community junior college. In fact, the community college is itself egalitarian by definition. The California state legislature, for example, funded Extended Opportunities Programs and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Services (EOPS) for students not otherwise able to continue school. Of the 14,000 students assisted in 1969-70, 75% were minority students. Community college students in general, in California, are 8.4% black (twice the proportion of 4-year schools), and 7.9% Mexican American. A survey of 2/3 of the community colleges nationwide, spring 1971, reported less than 1/4 of students enrolled in "remedial" classes as belonging to ethnic minorities. (p. 13, Cross, Beyond. . .) But clearly, when we talk about remedial anything, we are not talking solely about minority students or ghetto problems.

K. Patricia Cross has written what I believe to be one of the most interesting and most important books about the community college student that has appeared in some time: Beyond the Open Door, published by Jossey-Bass in 1971, describes student attitudes, interests, plans, and characteristics.

Pat Cross defines the "new students" of the 1970's as those scoring in the lowest 1/3 among national samples of young people on "traditional tests of academic ability." (p. 13) Her reasons are these: (1) Students "who have not considered college in the past but who are newly entering college in the 1970's are distinguished more by low test scores than by any other single measure available, including race, sex, and socio-economic status." (p. 14) And (2) new students have educational problems--i.e., do not perform traditional educational tasks with competence.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROFILE OF NEW STUDENTS: Most are caucasians whose fathers are blue-collar workers. A substantial number are members of minority ethnic groups. Most have parents with no college, and college expectations are new to the family. They are not especially successful at high school studies. (Traditional students, in the upper 1/3, usually make A's and B's; the new students make mostly C's. The traditional students are attracted to 4-year colleges and universities; the new students enter public community colleges or vocational schools.) (p. 15)

> The lowest 1/3 in K-12 years are learning different things from those intended for them to learn: e.g., "Most are becoming students of methods to avoid failure . . . Relative to other children in school, the below-average youngster in the fifth grade has a much better chance than the above-average child of shifting his position downward by the 12th grade. The very nature of the dropout statistics constantly threatens the relative position of the lower half of the class while leaving the upper half almost unaffected." (p. 18)

> The sorry fact is that if you are next to last, you become last when the last leaves his place, while whoever is first remains unaffected. There is always room at the bottom, it seems. (p. 19)

> Assuming again that it is the least successful students who drop out, students who were doing <u>above-average</u> work as sophomores in high school will--as a result of the dropout rate--graduate in the <u>bottom</u> third of their class. If senior high school teachers grade on the curve, a <u>B</u> student as a sopho more may quite suddenly find himself a <u>D</u> student as a senior--with <u>no</u> changes in his own study habits." (p. 20)

Pat Cross also cites the Atkinson-Feather theory "for the failure-threatened personality": If the major concern is to avoid failure, then any task of even intermediate difficulty is to be shunned as most dangerous.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The failure-threatened individual avoids tasks in which the outcome is uncertain. He is motivated to defend himself against the threat of failure either by selecting easy tasks, where success is virtually assured, or by attempting such difficult tasks that failure is expected and therefore not threatening." She also quotes Holt (How Children Fail) as saying: "'Children (who fear failure). . . may decide that if they can't have total success, their next best bet is to have total failure.'" (p. 85 in Holt, p. 23 in Cross)

> This fear-of-failure reaction to learning may account for the highly unrealistic aspirations that many community college educators see in their low-ability students. Not to succeed at being a doctor or a lawyer is not very threatening, because neither the student nor his associates have any real expectation that such a goal will be realized. (p. 23)

Cross concludes, therefore, that successful remediation programs must "devote considerable attention to a total reorientation of the students' approach to learning situations." (p. 26) Most frustrating to college personnel, she writes, is the apparent passivity of students in learning situations. The failure-threatened student seems to feel, "if I don't try very hard, I can't fail very much." She quotes Hold: ". . . You can't fall out of bed when you sleep on the floor." (p. 24) The student who has become passive must be shown that a new kind of learning situation exists--a situation in which he can almost certainly succeed if he makes an effort to do so. The "guaranteed-success" programs now being tried in some remedial-education programs show considerable promise for helping students to reorient themselves to learning tasks. The problem, she seems

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to be saying, is not with a program or its content, but with the student's own attitude toward learning. Perhaps all remedial-program teachers should be required to study the psychology of learning--it may be more helpful than a course in linguistics or Jacobean drama.

C. ADMINISTRATORS AND INSTITUTIONS

Administrators are people also, intuitive or sensing, thinking or feeling, perceptive or judging. Sometimes they convince themselves that what they do is of far greater importance than what teachers do--an attitude which may be either consciously or subconsciously reinforced by the adversary games which are played far too frequently between faculty and administration.

But planning developmental programs with total college cooperation involves administrators as well as teachers and students, and all such plans are clearly affected by institutional purpose.

Leslie Purdy, in "Helping Teachers Teach Better" (Change, Nov. 1973), reports the results of a study she made of a community college with a reputation for highly innovative teaching. Her purpose was to analyze, if she could, what really causes innovation to occur: what finally persuades teachers to explore new learning strategies and objectives. She reports four observations:

(1) That the "innovative" campus exhibited a high degree of "collegaueship"--i.e., innovation by contagion.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(2) That innovation was most likely to occur when the faculty found inexpensive media, clerical support, and other resources readily available--but not imposed.

(3) That teaching practices--whatever they are--reflect teachers' basic beliefs regarding teaching (so basic as to be, sometimes, unconscious or unadmitted)--e.g., a basic need for controlling the learning situation was true for both the traditional teacher who insisted on preserving his classroom with 30 students and a blackboard as well as for the teacher making extensive use of media.

(4) Attitudes toward administration were important. "Those teachers who felt that "the administrators manipulated the instructors to achieve predetermined administrative goals expressed little sense of responsibility to the college. Any desire to experiment with instructional practices seemed fruitless. Their cynical attitude reflected their feelings of being pawns in administrators' hands and they concentrated their energies on opposing administrative policies and generating discontent with other instructors." (56) "On the other hand, teachers who perceived that the administration respected faculty autonomy felt the freedom and responsibility within the institution to concentrate on improving instruction. That both perceptions of administrators could exist at the same college was partly a result of the ambiguous messages sent by the college administration regarding faculty autonomy in areas of instruction and curriculum. Faculty whose ideas for change were not in the direction of innovations favored by the administration did not receive much support." (56)

Institutional purposes, of course, also affect what the teacher does. The disparities among 2-year, 4-year, and university systems in terms of teaching load makes a difference. Farrell and Farrell, in "A Report on the Conditions of English Teaching, 1973-74" (Council-Grams, NCTE, Nov. 1973) cite a recent study by Alan Bayer for the American Council on Education:

13+ teaching hours per week	
Universities	17.2%
4-yr. colleges	27.6%
2-yr. colleges	72.6%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2 or fewer courses per term

Universities	52.8%
4-yr. colleges	28.6%
2-yr. colleges	14.2%

9 or more hours/week in research and writing unrelated to teaching

Universities	43.2%
4-yr. colleges	23.1%
2-yr. colleges	5.7%

John Roueche, in his ERIC monograph Salvage, Redirection, or Custody? Remedial Education in the Community Junior College commented 5 or 6 years ago that the community college had not been very successful in developmental education; that new and innovative approaches were needed, especially in the description and identification of the kinds of student who need developmental assistance.

The Farrells report that trends in the teaching of English include

--emphasis on developmental and remedial reading
--preoccupation with career education
--increased concern with oral English
--wide implementation of ESL programs

Within the community college itself, there appears to be--at last--a growing willingness to re-examine institutional purpose. As dropping enrollments create anxieties in higher education, four-year colleges and universities begin to open their doors somewhat wider, restoring a competition for students which has not occurred for nearly 20 years. Moreover, the community colleges are discovering, somewhat to their dismay, that more and more students are enrolling in fewer and fewer courses (thus

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

effectively reducing state-allocated funds based on ADA). Part-time students are also arranging themselves in new distributions, with as many students over 30 as are under 21, with a larger proportion of women students than has ever been the case before, and with a decreasing interest among students in the traditional transfer-pattern courses or even in courses meeting graduation requirements; with special-interest courses (Living with Divorce, Science Fiction, The American West in Fiction and Film, Sights and Sounds of the 20th Century, The Life and Times of Jesus) attracting more students than do the traditional courses. Students are no longer militantly against the system; they're just quietly going their own ways--in and out of colleges, ignoring requirements which don't interest them, pursuing interests which do even though they may not be part of any long-range plan, worrying about careers and selecting courses which contribute to career planning, etc.

All of this causes us to ask ourselves whether the community college as it was traditionally conceived--with a comprehensive curriculum designed to accommodate both transfer and career students--is still appropriate to changing local community demands. Should we admit that we are really providing an educational smorgasboard, or that our primary purpose should be career-training?

D. THE DISCIPLINE

Piet Hein has something to say here, too:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IF YOU KNOW WHAT I MEAN

A poet should be of the
old-fashioned meaningless brand:
obscure, esoteric, symbolic,--
the critics demand it;
so if there's a poem of mine
that you do understand
I'll gladly explain what it means
till you don't understand it.
(Hein, Grooks, p. 42)

But let me go back to the English-teacher personality inventory for a moment. It will be something of a stereotype, and a generalization, but sometimes both of those are helpful and appropriate to a larger view. And it might soften it a bit if I include me. We are first of all humanists: we believe ourselves to be infinitely concerned about the human condition, and endlessly interested in education, including our students' welfare. We identify strongly with the academic culture--the intellectual liberal tradition. We hate the establishment--whatever that is. We can't really understand why anyone would ever have voted for Nixon--even though some of us may have in fact done so. We are strongly anti-bureaucratic and, therefore, anti-administrative policies and procedures as well. Whatever the current groundswell for social reform, we're for it--as long as our university counterparts are too. We believe ourselves highly tolerant of disabilities in our students, but in our secret hearts we really prefer the exceedingly bright ones. We are thoroughly intolerant of and impatient with all forms of intrusion into what we think of as our own territory--all supervision of teaching, all restrictions on when we report to or leave campus, all forms of accounting for our absences from

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the classroom, all requirements for regulation of curriculum or text adoptions, all manipulations of teaching schedules which begin before 9:00 a.m. or end after 2:00 p.m. We strongly believe that the use of behavioral objectives for our discipline is impossible and should not be imposed on us. What we teach is so ineffably important that it cannot be measured; what we expect our students to learn is infinitely immeasurable and indefinable; we must be free to teach by impulse (only we call it spontaneity). Our classes are often much more lively if we plan at the red light on the way to the campus what we are going to talk about that day; careful planning tends to inhibit and stifle ingenuity and spontaneity, we tell ourselves. The teaching of literature and writing is not logical or systematic or quantifiable or predictable. It is intuitive. It is immediately responsive. It is more feeling than thinking.

If this is exaggerated, consider the following. If you examine the literature published by NCTE or the 4 C's, or the literary magazines, note well: nothing ever changes very much. Three topics continue to be presented in a variety of ways: (1) censorship, (2) how to present the discipline in such a way as to be "relevant," and (3) whether or not one should impose standardized English on students whose dialect differs from ours.

Censorship we need not pursue here. But on the subject of relevance, let me suggest this: whatever we consider currently relevant to our students, by the time we arrive at it, is probably irrelevant. We tend to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

be guilty of "fadthink," and assume that students--especially community college students--cannot be excited by or become involved with Donne, or Dostoevsky. We produce scores of anthologies for use in freshman English every year, with such titles as Pop Arts in America, Alienation, The Whole Earth, Ecology Reader, The American Search for Identity, Encounter, Here and Now I and Here and Now II. We may even convert our freshman English composition course to something we think will reach the students better than teaching them how to write: "Writing about TV," "Focus on Magic and the Occult," "Self-Awareness," "Getting to Know Me," "Modern Films," "How to Get the Most out of TV."

John D'Arms, in his "The Banality of Relevance" (Change, April 1974), reminds us that "Something must always be 'relevant' or 'irrelevant' to something." There must be a frame of reference "explicitly stated or clearly understood." As a classicist, he expresses frustration with the attempt on the part of some of his colleagues to make classical studies more "relevant" by advertising courses like "Environmental Pollution in Ancient Rome," or "Eroticism and Family Life in Greece and Rome," or "Madness and Deviant Behavior in Greece and Rome."

> And so a classicist gets used to being treated in the wider context of modern American society as some kind of freak--relatively harmless, perhaps, but definitely odd. Few classicists ever appear outside academic circles to address large audiences about their professional work. It is true that my father did once--he was a classicist for 14 years before he joined one of the opulent New York Foundations. Just before Thanksgiving in 1941 he was invited to address the Junior Chamber of Commerce and its special guests in Denver, Colorado.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

> He had something new and important to say about the way Mussolini used Roman documents of the time of the emperor Augustus as fascist propaganda, and was expecting an audience of about 15. But to his astonishment the large room was filled to capacity. He was introduced; he spoke; there was polite, restrained applause. The master of ceremonies thanked him, turned to the audience, and said: "Now, ladies and gentlemen, American homemakers, the speaker we've all been waiting for: T.P. Twitchell of Twitchell's Cutlery, who will demonstrate how to carve your Thanksgiving turkey." (34-35)

D'Arms goes on to say:

> . . . Classicism, far from being narrow, is really the first genuine area studies program (described that way to many a modern colleague, we sound much better): at least 1,200 years of Greek history, 1,200 years of Roman, two rich languages, epic and lyric and elegaic and pastoral poetry, tragedy, biography, historiography, religion, philosophy, art, architecture--we are the spokesmen for an incredibly varied and rich tradition. (35)

And what of the perennial argument regarding the teaching of standardized English? The debate continues. But a recent article by Sledd--one of the top professors of linguistics--illustrates the paradox. His thesis: Who are we to impose our way of talking and writing on those whose dialect is different from ours? But his article appears in a scholarly magazine, written in the kind of prose most of us envy for its lucidity and style--a standard which must be met before one can hope to reach the top of the profession, or to hold a position similar to Sledd's! We are, perhaps, a bundle of contradictions--not necessarily paradoxical (since paradox is truth standing on its head to attract attention, and our contradictions are not always truthful). We have been attracted to a discipline which is highly academic, highly abstract. It requires a considerable sensitivity

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to symbol and the layers of meaning inherent in any art. Chances are we are intrigued or fascinated by words--either their etymology, their sequence, their symbolism, or all of those together. We probably deplore the Madison Avenue style; we don't like billboards. We never admit to watching television--unless it is a political, sociological, or literary special.

Yet we contract to teach students (whose ears are deaf to language, whose vocabularies are poverty stricken, whose preferences are whatever advertising suggests, whose skills are non-verbal) to write and--worse--to read! Furthermore, we disagree with each other about what should be done, how it should be done, who should do it, and to whom it should be done! Then we compound the issue by distrusting each others' judgment, textbooks, and teaching techniques. We have an overwhelming conviction that no learning occurs without individual attention from us. Nevertheless, we believe we can save the world, take all comers, destroy Madison Avenue, restore order and improve communication.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT'S WHY

Why do bad writers
win the fight?
Why do good writers
die in need?
Because the writers
who can't write
are read by readers
who can't read.
(Hein, Grooks 2, p. 40)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MAKING AN EFFORT

> Our so-called limitations, I believe
> apply to faculties we don't apply.
> We don't discover what we can't achieve
> until we make an effort not to try.
> (Ibid., p. 29)

The case for terminal or behavioral objectives is exceedingly strong. If you don't know where you are going, you can't know how to get there. If you can't describe what it is your students should be able to do--or how they will feel--when they leave you, you can't expect them to change. Objectives are not the monstrous quantification of affective experiences which our anxieties may lead us to believe. Of course students learn things which are indefinable; of course some of their attitudes and values are affected, modified, or sharply changed; of course internal change is hard or impossible to identify, demonstrate, or define--especially when the change is subtle, long-range, and intensely personal; of course some clear objectives, clearly described, do not lend themselves to objective measurement. Given all these "of-courses," it is still necessary (and honest) to let the students in on your plans; to tell them each step of the way what it is you want them to be able to do. In any sequence of courses students are considerably reassured when they know what is expected of them at each level. The beginning assumptions about student skills or achievement for a given course should be almost identical with the concluding objectives of the course prerequisites to it. There is really nothing difficult about that. It merely requires

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

attention to detail! Furthermore, English teachers can agree on terminal objectives or goals, leaving themselves still free to pursue those objectives by any means which suits them. If, e.g., a terminal objective of freshman composition is that every student enrolling in any section of the course will, at the end of the term, be able to document a research paper appropriately, then how or when or by what means each teacher teaches that skill is his own business--as long as his students attain the objective. If it is assumed that every student who enters freshman composition will be able to write a coherent paragraph with an identifiable topic sentence, and adequate development and support of his point, then that skill should be one of the terminal objectives of any course which immediately precedes freshman composition. This is not to say that some students will not need a review of that skill; but even if they do, the restoration of the skill after some time has elapsed between courses should require much less time than it would take to teach paragraph writing from the beginning.

Arthur Cohen, who has conducted research at UCLA on the teaching of English--especially composition--indicates that evaluation of student writing can be exercised consistently:

> For a study of this type to be successful--(use of scoring key which includes yes/no responses to specific questions regarding content, organization, and mechanics)--that is, to yield valid data that instructors will trust--the participants must design their own composition scoring device, arguing with each other about the meaning of terms until they are satisfied and can use it reliably. ("Assessing College Students' Ability to Write Compositions," pp. 370-371)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HOW TO PLAN A DEVELOPMENTAL ENGLISH PROGRAM WITH COLLEGE-WIDE COOPERATION
Edith A. Freligh

I attended a retreat for administrators recently, at which management by objectives was being discussed. Finally, someone explained that objectives were what God asked Moses to write. Then another commented, "But who put all those 'Thou shalt nots' in front of them?"

Once again: conclusions and recommendations:

(1) We have not sufficiently identified or described the kinds of students who require extra help before they can succeed in the programs which they came to us to get. Pat Cross' findings are of considerable help, as would be analysis on your own campuses--of the characteristics of the students you get. Counseling departments, or administrative offices might do well to consult with faculty regarding the kinds of things it might be helpful to know about students, and then seek the information.

(2) It is essential, before any planning can take place, that the aims and purposes--objectives--of all developmental programs be clearly described. The development of objectives cannot proceed, obviously, without accurate data regarding the students and the community. It is always better to begin with a few general goals for a developmental program than to get bogged down in detailed lists of objectives. Task or unit objectives, designed as a course proceeds, step-by-step, can be defined as you go. But whatever your style, your objectives--if they are alive--will be continuously revised.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(3) English teachers are often frustrated by the fact that, in their view, the standardized tests which are available on the market--the English Coop, the Purdue, the California Test of English Usage, the ACT, the CLEP or CEEB exams--do not adequately test what the teachers teach. And that may be so. It often happens, too, that English teachers believe the only valid test is when an English teacher reads a sample of a student's writing. And that too may be so. However, we're still stuck with large numbers of entering students, many of whom have great difficulties with reading and writing, who must be somehow placed where they can be most effectively helped. Large numbers in most cases preclude reading of individual essays. CEEB and CLEP exams, which include writing samples, cost money. English teachers or readers are not available during the summer when the majority of students may be applying for admission.

Worse than all of those problems, the tests not only fail to test--in the view of many English teachers--what must be taught, but they fail to diagnose a student's difficulties. Now if you belong to the school of thought which believes we should leave the student's dialect alone, and that it is unnecessary to teach him "standard" English, and that misspelling doesn't matter any more than sentence fragments or subject-verb mismatches do, then you don't have a problem. You can

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

make all of your courses electives and emphasize the teaching of what you love most--perhaps literature. But if you do believe developmental programs are necessary, that some corrective measures must be taken, that the way a student reads and writes will not only affect his success in college but may affect his success as a voter or as a white-collar or professional or blue-collar worker as well, the diagnosis of his disabilities is essential. I do not know of any diagnostic instrument on the market which would make it easy for us to direct students toward courses or units of modules which they need and allow them to avoid the ones they don't need. It is an area which sorely needs exploration. But I do not believe the development of effective diagnostic instruments for the teaching of language skills is at all impossible. I think you are the ones who can do it, if you will.

(4) Assuming that diagnostic testing or diagnosis by conference or in classes has been developed, the next step in the planning of developmental programs might be to develop a wide variety of learning strategies designed to accommodate student differences. Some students are turned on by computers; some enjoy slides or filmstrips which present patterns graphically; some prefer to read; some cannot progress without frequent contact with an instructor--either in small groups or in conferences; some will watch anything with fascination as long as it's on

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

a screen; some will respond much more readily to student tutors, etc. Any system of teaching which assumes that all students respond to the same stimuli is obviously bound to be unsuccessful with some students. Students often select teachers on the basis of grapevine information--why not learning strategies as well?

(5) Evaluation of programs and teaching modes is the one ingredient too often missing in the kinds of programs--developmental or otherwise--which we create in the community college. Most of us have some form of evaluation which is focused on the teaching process if not on the teacher himself. But why not focus that attention on student learning instead. The mark of success for a teacher is the success of his students. And I don't mean grade distributions. I do mean whether or not a student has met the objectives of your course. Can he do what it was you told him you wanted him to be able to do at the end of the course? And there is some doing involved in every course. His feelings and attitudes are much more difficult to assess, and maybe they don't need to be described; but his behavior in terms of the skills or knowledge which you have expected him to master are measureable. If 90% of your students drop out or earn D's and C's perhaps you or he is not clear about the objectives. If 90% earn A's and B's, perhaps you have not defined the criteria which must be met for success.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The clearest objectives describe what the student should be able to do, how well he should do it, and the conditions under which it must be done. Evaluation of learning appears to me to be infinitely more appropriate than evaluation of teaching.

(6) Administrators are a special breed. Sometimes they are difficult and obtuse. Sometimes they are keenly interested in and sensitive to the learning process. Sometimes they are highly autocratic, and sometimes they are democratic to the point of absurdity--abdicating responsibility both for results and for standards of excellence. But whatever your administrators are like, they are not likely to accept your recommendations and pleas for special programs and media and facilities and time at face value. Your opinion in the matter--expert or not--is not admissible alone. English teachers (or any teachers) who fail to consider the practical, humdrum detail of costs will fail if they attempt persuasions which neglect to take costs into account. For example, teachers who plead for smaller classes--10 or 15 students--on the grounds that the quality of instruction and learning is thereby assured must also consider that the smaller the student-teacher ratio, the more staff is required to accommodate students; the more staff, the lower all salaries must be; the lower the salaries, the more difficult to attract excellent staff; the lower the student-teacher ratio,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the lower the availability of adequate facilities, clerical support, and supplies. No administrator is opposed to quality control; all of us are frustrated by fiscal limitations. Some of us are continuously concerned about teaching load and the drain of energies, ideas, and creativity which occurs when teachers are overloaded. I am not suggesting a formula or a panacea; I do not suggest that teachers alone are impractical. I do suggest that if both teachers and administrators will examine their adversary roles when they occur, their distrust of each others' motives, and their assumption that everyone's needs are the same, we shall progress toward better solutions. English teachers are, by and large, a creative, imaginative, caring, impractical lot. I am the last one to want to inhibit or stifle that creativity. But I am torn by the fact that we cannot continue to teach as we have in the past, in the traditional ways, and be successful.

Student enrollments in English classes are steadily dropping. Why? Institutions--both 4-year and 2-year--are gradually dropping all requirements in English. Why? The University of California is complaining, currently, that the top 8-12% of the high school students which they admit cannot write. But the university English department itself is the source of many of the high school English teachers who are, apparently, failing to teach their students to write.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HOW TO PLAN A DEVELOPMENTAL ENGLISH PROGRAM WITH COLLEGE-WIDE COOPERATION
Edith A. Frelich

We live in a Peter-Paul bureaucracy. As long as budgets are fixed, we must set priorities within the limits of monies we have available.

Now, given those realities, it would seem logical that we must analyze the situation for what it is. We simply cannot afford English classes which are limited to 10 or 12 students--unless we pay for that limitation in some other way.

It would seem high time that we reexamine some of the myths--and I truly believe some of them are myths--surrounding the teaching of English, not only for fiscal reasons but also for professional reasons:

(1) Should every student--even the one-year or six-month student--be required to pass a writing course?

(2) Is there no body of information within the study of language and literature--historical or structural or analytical--which is just that: a body of information?

(3) Is it <u>really</u> true that information about language patterns cannot be studied apart from writing, as a separate course of study?

(4) Is it <u>really</u> true that if a student learns to <u>recognize</u>, let's say, unclear constructions (inappropriate fragments, misspellings, mismatched subjects and verbs, ambiguous reference) that he cannot bring that <u>recognition skill</u> to an analysis of his own writing?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(5) Is it really true that no part of the teaching of English or literature can be accomplished in large groups, over TV, through video or audio-tapes, with computers, etc.?

(6) Is it really true that no student can learn anything except in your presence?

(7) Is it really true that the academic approach to expository reading and writing will equip a student to read the editorial pages with understanding and insight, to vote intelligently, to be discriminating in what he wathces on TV? If not, why not? Or should that even be claimed as an objective (or by-product) of the teaching of English?

(8) Is it really true that a student who takes your remedial or composition course will write better essay exams and cease to mystify his anthropology and history teachers with his creative spelling?

(9) Should we abandon all attempts to teach literacy and style in the belief that our students have failed for 12 years anyway, and they're too old to learn now?

Requirements for Developing Programs:

(1) Honest analysis of English-teacher predilections.

(2) Honest recognition of different predilections

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

among most of our students.

(3) Continuous renewal of aims and purposes of:

(a) institution.

(b) the discipline.

(4) The exercise of self-discipline in the systematic, detailed, practical work of creating a developmental program.

(5) Acceptance of the notion that teaching of elementary reading/writing is a service to other kinds of people and a service to other kinds of disciplines.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arthur M. Cohen. "Assessing College Students' Ability to Write Compositions." Research in the Teaching of English. 7:356-371, Winter 1973.

K. Patricia Cross. Beyond the Open Door. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

John H. D'Arms. "The Banality of Relevance." Change. 6:34-39, April 1974.

Earle G. Eley. "English Programs for Terminal Students." Research and the Development of English Programs in the Junior College. Proceedings of the NCTE Conference, Tempe, Arizona, 1965.

Jerome Evans. "Free Access: What It Takes." Change. 6:53-54, March 1974.

Edmund J. Farrell and Jo Ann Farrell. "A Report on the Conditions of English Teaching, 1973-74." Council Grams. (NCTE) XXXIII, November 1973.

Piet Hein. Grooks. Garden City, New Jersey: Doubleday, 1966.

Piet Hein. Grooks 2. Garden City, New Jersey: Doubleday, 1968.

D. W. Keirsey and Marilyn Bates. "An Application of the Myers-Briggs Personality Type Inventory to Administrative Styles." (unpublished papers presented at a management workshop, Golden West College, Huntington Beach, California, January 1974.)

Leslie Purdy. "Helping Teachers Teach Better." Change. 5:55-56+, November 1973.

John E. Roueche. Salvage, Redirection, or Custody? Remedial English in the Community Junior College, Monograph. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, 1968.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ely Stock. "From Ivy League to Community College." Change. 5:56-57+, September 1973.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CRITICAL THINKING IN COMMUNICATION

Henry R. Fea*

Oral and graphic symbols usually require interpretation beyond literal. Even a simple remark such as, "It is hot today," requires the listener to supply background, to compare and conclude. The "It" must refer to the weather, "Hot" is not a standard measure and is the opinion of the speaker. When Portia in The Merchant of Venice stated that, "The quality of mercy is not strained;" the listener should not envision gobs of mercy dripping slowly through a colander. Mental activity beyond literal acceptance is categorized as Critical Thinking. It is truly the soul of communication.

Given that critical thinking is vital to communication, adults should be able to distinguish critical thinking from other types of thought, understand the process of thinking critically, and be able to teach children to think critically. Yet this is not the case. Gray (1), after a study of thirty years of research on the subject, concluded that elementary school age children are capable of critical thinking and critical reading, but are not taught to do so. Gray (1:457)

> Critical reading and thinking instruction should be emphasized in college methods courses. Teachers may need in-service training in critical reading instruction and perhaps even in critical reading.

Many students of thinking would agree with her. Many teachers cannot teach it. Many teachers cannot think, listen and read critically, beyond the simple levels required for everyday activities.

*Professor, Educational Psychology, University of Washington

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This statement is not intended as an indictment of schools and teachers. It is intended as a suggestion that, in this accountability-for-teaching era, there may be ways of teaching which have greater yield per pupil per hour.

There appears to be abounding faith among laymen and superintendents that teachers think critically, and can teach their students to do likewise. The faith is heartwarming but misplaced. Why should teachers be able to teach what they were never taught? Laymen do not expect it from professionals. Only those who prepare for the law are taught to think and read critically. And even here there are exceptions beyond belief. For example: Over the past decade the supreme court has had great difficulty in arriving at a working definition of "obscenity," because of its abstract and personal nature. Yet it has experienced no difficulty, apparently, defining "justice," which is even more abstract and personal.

Critical thinking becomes more difficult as the listener is expected to supply more background and make finer distinctions, and it is in these situations that the lack in the thinker becomes obvious. Some examples will illustrate this deficiency.

The following problem has been used for graduate students over the past three years:

> From the novel, Deliverance (2:40), the speaker describes "sliding" but does not give an example. In ten lines take the speaker through a situation which might be classified by him as "sliding." (Remember - a reader lives a scene through his senses).
>
> "I'm a get-through-the-day man. I don't think I was ever anything else. I am not a great art director. I am not a great archer. I am mainly interested in sliding. Do you know what sliding is?...Sliding is living antifriction. It is finding a modest thing you can do and greasing that thing. On both sides."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The following is one answer selected at random:

> "The speaker is an art director. A situation in which he would consider himself sliding would be where he should say something to help someone or the entire situation but doesn't because it would cause conflict. He might see some mistakes or feel some mistakes but he doesn't voice them because it is easier not to say something and maybe have his ideas rejected. He would consider himself sliding in being an archer because he doesn't practice very much and because he doesn't have the desire to be very good at it."

Another example:

> "For example a student will slide through a course by copying homework, by studying just enough to pass the tests, by always smiling and being nice to the teacher, by just making deadlines."

Note that the author says he is not a great artist...it cannot be assumed that he is an artist of any sort, yet the first student has assumed the author is an art director. Further, the author states, "It is finding a modest thing you can do..." The second writer has ignored this limitation in his interpretation of "sliding." Neither student has appealed to the senses of the future reader.

Why is it that many adults cannot think critically? Is it a skill which is difficult to acquire and therefore not to be expected from the average adult? Or is it that adults have never been taught the skill and therefore practice it only to the degree required by a society which neither understands nor demands critical standards of thought? In the opinion of one writer, Epstein (3:122):

> "It has been the writer's experience in working with college students in reading improvement and study skills laboratory that they have never developed literal and critical comprehension skills or an efficient method

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

> of using them. The fact that recall and application of the information acquired are essential ingredients of reading comprehension seems to be learned more by osmosis than formal instruction."

Epstein's work was with medical students.

In the opinion of the present writer, the problem lies primarily in ignorance of the nature of critical thinking and of its critical attributes.

Human beings solve most problems by means of associative thinking. It is an everyday, workhorse type of thinking which solves the bulk of human problems with the least effort. It consists of searching back in the memory for similar circumstances whenever a problem is encountered, such as, "Why won't the car start?" And it consists of recalling what was done on that occasion to solve the problem. The thinker may go so far as to remember what a neighbor did when his car would not start. The result is a number of alternatives such as kick the tires, call a garage, etc. The alternative most likely to provide a solution is selected and acted upon.

Critical thinking above the simplest levels is indicated whenever no similar situation can be recalled for a solution to a problem situation. The thinker is stuck because associative thinking will not yield a solution. To use critical thinking the thinker must be familiar with the nature of assumptions, and the process of selecting a standard for evaluating opinions. The two form the necessary and sufficient attributes for critical thinking. The individual begins by examining assumptions relative to the problem then continues to infer possibilities within

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the limits of the assumptions. Inference involves so little literal interpretation, from the language stimulus, and so much exploration of the mind of the thinker, that many students of thinking will not accept inference as part of listening, speaking, writing and reading. They equate it with intelligence. Carroll (4) is an example.

Perhaps, at this juncture, an example of critical thinking with the critical attributes indicated, would be enlightening. Suppose the following sentence is presented out of context:

> "Hostile Indians shot flaming arrows into the covered wagons."

If the reader thinks about it critically he will proceed as follows: The "Indians" must be the plains Indians of the American West...because in communication there is always an assumption that a word is used in its commonest sense, or most frequently used context unless otherwise indicated. Since there is nothing to indicate that Indians from India were in the mind of the writer, the reader must interpret "Indians" as "American Indians" of the plains. "Covered wagons" must be interpreted in the same way. The reader cannot assume that the wagons are covered with sheet iron and therefore impervious to fire because there is nothing to indicate that the wagons are not of the canvas-top variety. Likewise, "flaming arrows," must refer to the flaming arrows used by the plains Indians under such circumstances. So what is there to think about further? In this case merely the word "Hostile." Must the reader assume that the writer used this term correctly? And the answer is that there is a STANDARD to which the reader may refer to check this--the dictionary.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The dictionary defines "hostile" as "Intent to harm..." But who knows the intent of an individual besides that individual? The answer, obviously, is no one. Therefore, by use of this standard the reader should conclude that the historian, or the writer had no right to use this word. He could have used "Seemingly hostile" as the shooting of flaming arrows in the direction of the covered wagons could be interpreted as an unfriendly act...but he did not have the right to state that the Indians were "Hostile." So much for assumptions, for a standard, and for thinking and forming conclusions within their limits.

Critical thinking is identifying the assumptions underlying the verbal statement, examining them to reveal the limitations within which the thinking will take place, accepting those which are found to be mutually acceptable, reserving those assumptions which are questionable, and evaluating those assumptions against standards which are accepted as valid.

Critical thinking requires discipline. Few adults are willing to expend the time and effort. The skill is not taught. That which passes for critical thinking in schools is a number of lessons in propaganda, in which students are shown examples of classes of propaganda and then required to classify new examples. Correctly classifying examples of propaganda is not critical thinking but conceptual thinking students are fitting examples to known classes. Free exchange of opinion also is considered to be critical thinking. Opinion without examination of assumptions and evaluation of statements by means of standards is worthless. I can state that I believe music today would

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

be much improved by use of more half notes. Since I know nothing of music and have no idea what a half note is, my opinion is ridiculous. Voltaire did state: "I do not agree with what you say but I would defend to the death your right to say it." But he was referring to free speech - not to the veridicality of opinion. Where did we get the idea that opinion is of value? Examples set by radio and television reporters asking the first ten persons they meet on a street to express an opinion, and then tabulating pro and con and formulating conclusions about the larger number daily add to this fallacy of the value of uninformed opinion.

Thinking is a most complex subject. A complete examination of critical thinking would take volumes. But for practical application in school, college and daily life the attributes discussed and illustrated here will suffice. Examples of deeper exploration into communication and critical thinking are to be found in references such as Ennis (5), Spearritt (6), and Fraim (7).

For reasons difficult to explain it seems appropriate to close with a quotation from that ancient Irish philosopher, Finn Cool Murphy:

> "If you explain something so clearly that
> no one can misunderstand it, someone will."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Gray, Marian M. "Research and Elementary School Critical Reading Instruction." The Reading Teacher. 22:457, February 1969.

2. Dickey, J. Deliverance. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1970.

3. Epstein, M. "A Study Technique to Enhance Comprehension at the College Level," in Forging Ahead in Reading. J. A. Figurel (ed.). Newark: International Reading Association, 1968. pp. 122-127.

4. Carroll, J. B. "Defining Language Comprehension: Some Speculations." Research Memorandum. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1971. pp. 71-79.

5. Ennis, R. H. "A Concept of Critical Thinking." Harvard Educational Review. 32:81-111, Winter 1962.

6. Spearritt, D. "Identification of Subskills of Reading Comprehension by Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis." Reading Research Quarterly. 8:92-111, Fall 1972.

7. Fraim, Emma C. "Book Reports - Tools for Thinking." Journal of Reading. 17:122-128, November 1973.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Mary Aldrich	Seattle Central Community College Seattle, Washington
Doreen Amorosa	Tacoma Community College Tacoma, Washington
Brian Backstrand	Sheldon Jackson College Sitka, Alaska
Karen A. Becker	Tacoma Community College Tacoma, Washington
Bert Bickel	Green River Community College Auburn, Washington
Paul Blowers	Fort Steilacoom Community College Lakewood Center, Washington
Paul E. Borg	Yakima Valley College Yakima, Washington
Arlene S. Buchanan	Olympia Vocational Technical Institute Olympia, Washington
Suzanne Butschun	Tacoma Community College Tacoma, Washington
Ralph Carlson	Centralia College Centralia, Washington
Clara Cox	Tacoma Community College Tacoma, Washington
Julie Cushman	Olympia Vocational Technical Institute Olympia, Washington
C. Tom Erickson	Everett Community College Everett, Washington
Henry Fea	University of Washington Seattle, Washington
Edith A. Freligh	Golden West College Huntington Beach, California

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Archer Goff	Clark College Vancouver, Washington
Dick Goff	Sheldon Jackson College Sitka, Alaska
Mary Goff	Sheldon Jackson College Sitka, Alaska
Helen Gough	Seattle Central Community College Seattle, Washington
Thomas Green	Centralia College Centralia, Washington
Kathy Gregoire	Edmonds Community College Lynnwood, Washington
Nicki Haynes	Everett Community College Everett, Washington
Mary Hicks	Tacoma Community College Tacoma, Washington
Ken Hildebrant	Mt. Hood Community College Gresham, Oregon
Ron Hofmann	Chemeketa Community College Salem, Oregon
Patricia Horner	Bellevue Community College Bellevue, Washington
Ted Keaton	Everett Community College Everett, Washington
Hanna Kozasa	North Seattle Community College Seattle, Washington
Annette Lambson	Clark College Vancouver, Washington
Gloria Mercer	Bellevue Community College Bellevue, Washington
Jane Merritt	Whatcom Community College Ferndale, Washington

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Alice Milholland	Big Bend Community College Moses Lake, Washington
Patricia J. Newton	Fort Steilacoom Community College Lakewood Center, Washington
Lynn Nielson	Tacoma Community College Tacoma, Washington
Neal Nogler	Centralia College Centralia, Washington
Sylvia Pagano	Green River Community College Auburn, Washington
E. ElResa Paul	Clatsop Community College Astoria, Oregon
Marilyn Pierik	Mt. Hood Community College Gresham, Oregon
Betty Pritchett	Mt. Hood Community College Gresham, Oregon
Michael E. Randall	University of Washington Seattle, Washington
George Range	Oregon Technical Institute Klamath Falls, Oregon
Don L. Reed	Chemeketa Community College Salem, Oregon
Harold Reedy	Big Bend Communtiy College Moses Lake, Washington
Henry Reitan	University of Washington Seattle, Washington
Elmer Schurman	Clark College Vancouver, Washington
Deborah Scott	North Seattle Community College Seattle, Washington
Susan Shrader	Clark College Vancouver, Washington

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Virginia Shrauger	Central Oregon Community College Bend, Oregon
Julia Shrout	Mt. Hood Community College Gresham, Oregon
W. G. Simmons	Skagit Valley College Mt. Vernon, Washington
Carolyn Simonson	Tacoma Community College Tacoma, Washington
Connie Simpson	Sheldon Jackson College Sitka, Alaska
Elaine Smith	Yakima Valley College Yakima, Washingotn
William Sperling	Wenatchee Valley College Wenatchee, Washington
Truman Stageberg	College of New Caledonia Prince George, B.C.
Carole Steadman	Tacoma Community College Tacoma, Washington
Juanita E. Thomas	Seattle Central Community College Seattle, Washington
Elaine Travenick	North Seattle Community College Seattle, Washington
Josie Uhlman	Yakima Valley College Yakima, Washington
Laurence Welch	Peninsula College Pt. Angeles, Washington
Ted White	Everett Community College Everett, Washington
William Wilde	Mt. Hood Community College Gresham, Oregon
Margaret Williams	Fort Steilacoom Community College Lakewood Center, Washington

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Dave Williamson	Edmonds Community College Lynnwood, Washington
Wilcey Winchell	Clark College Vancouver, Washington

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

NOV 1 1974

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION